

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

IN RE:

OPENAI, INC.

COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT  
LITIGATION

This Document Relates To:

Case No. 1:23-cv-08292-SHS-OTW

Case No. 1:23-cv-11195-SHS-OTW

Case No. 1:25-md-3143-SHS-OTW

**DEFENDANT MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S  
RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO SEAL**

Pursuant to Paragraph 34 of the Stipulated Protective Order (ECF 367), Defendant Microsoft Corporation (“Microsoft”) submits this response in support of Plaintiffs The New York Times Company and Authors Guild Inc., *et al.*’s (“Plaintiffs”) Motion to Seal portions of their letter motion to compel the OpenAI Defendants related to their text and social media productions (ECF 385) (“Motion”) requesting that Exhibits 6 (ECF 390-5) and 7 (ECF 390-6) be sealed in their entirety.

Although “[t]he common law right of public access to judicial documents is firmly rooted in our nation’s history,” this right is not absolute and courts “must balance competing considerations against” the presumption of access. *Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435 F.3d 110, 119–20 (2d Cir. 2006). “The proponent of sealing ‘must demonstrat[e] that closure is essential to preserve higher values and is narrowly tailored to serve that interest.’” *Bernstein v. Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossman LLP*, 814 F.3d 132, 144 (2d Cir. 2016) (quoting *In re N.Y. Times Co.*, 828 F.2d 110, 116 (2d Cir. 1987)). “[T]he presumption of public access in filings submitted in connection with discovery disputes . . . is generally somewhat lower than the presumption applied

to material introduced at trial, or in connection with dispositive motions . . . .” *Brown v. Maxwell*, 929 F.3d 41, 50 (2d Cir. 2019). “[W]hile a court must still articulate specific and substantial reasons for sealing such material, the reasons usually need not be as compelling as those required to seal summary judgment filings.” *Id.*

Exhibits 6 and 7 to the Plaintiffs’ letter motion are highly confidential documents, the disclosure of which would unfairly prejudice Microsoft. Exhibits 6 and 7, which have been designated “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY” pursuant to the Protective Order, contain highly confidential information about Microsoft’s work with OpenAI and other third parties to the litigation. *See* Ex. A (Declaration of Lucky Vidmar). They are also documents that have been exchanged during the course of discovery and are designated under the Protective Order. *New York Times*, ECF 378. Microsoft requests that Exhibits 6 and 7 be sealed in their entirety.

The information Microsoft seeks to seal and redact is the type of information commonly found to warrant sealing. *See id.* (granting motion to seal similar information and documents in this case); *see also Regeneron Pharms., Inc. v. Novartis Pharma AG*, No. 1:20-CV-05502, 2021 WL 243943 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 25, 2021) (finding that requested redactions were “narrowly tailored to protect competitive business information, including the non-public terms of [various agreements]” and concluding “that the sensitivity of this information outweighs the presumption of access”); *Louis Vuitton Malletier S.A. v. Sunny Merch. Corp.*, 97 F. Supp. 3d 485, 511 (S.D.N.Y. 2015) (citation omitted) (concluding that proposed redactions were “generally limited to specific business information and strategies, which, if revealed, ‘may provide valuable insights into a company’s current business practices that a competitor would seek to exploit.’”).

For the reasons stated above, and those set forth in the Declaration of Lucky Vidmar, Microsoft supports Plaintiffs' Motion to Seal portions of their letter motion to compel the OpenAI Defendants related to their text and social media productions (ECF 385). Specifically, Microsoft requests that Exhibits 6 (ECF 390-5) and 7 (ECF 390-6) be sealed in their entirety.

Dated: August 5, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jared B. Briant

Jared B. Briant (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP  
1144 Fifteenth Street, Suite 3400  
Denver, CO 80202  
Telephone: (303) 607-3500  
Facsimile: (303) 607-3600  
Email: jared.briant@faegredrinker.com  
Email: kirstin.stolldeb主@faegredrinker.com

Annette L. Hurst (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
The Orrick Building  
405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2669  
Telephone: (415) 773-5700  
Facsimile: (415) 773-5759  
Email: ahurst@orrick.com

Christopher Cariello  
Marc Shapiro  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
51 West 52<sup>nd</sup> Street  
New York: NY 10019  
Telephone: (212) 506-3778  
Facsimile: (212) 506-5151  
Email: ccariello@orrick.com  
mrshapiro@orrick.com

Sheryl Koval Garko (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Laura Brooks Najemy (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
222 Berkeley Street, Suite 2000  
Boston, MA 02116  
Telephone: (617) 880-1800  
Facsimile: (617) 8801-1801

Email: sgarko@orrick.com  
lnajemy@orrick.com

Carrie A. Beyer (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP  
320 South Canal Street, Suite 3300  
Chicago, IL 60606-5707  
Telephone: (312) 569-1000  
Facsimile: (312) 569-3000  
Email: carrie.beyer@faegredrinker.com

Jeffrey S. Jacobson  
FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas, 41<sup>st</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10036  
Telephone: (212) 248-3140  
Facsimile: (212) 248-3141  
Email: jeffrey.jacobson@faegredrinker.com

Elizabeth M.C. Scheibel (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP  
2200 Wells Fargo Center, 90 S. 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 766-7000  
Facsimile: (612) 766-1600  
Email: elizabeth.scheibel@faegredrinker.com

*Attorneys for Defendant Microsoft Corporation*